Application No.: 10/671,447 Docket No.: 0425-1084P

Reply dated June 29, 2006

to Office Action of April 3, 2006

Page 18 of 21

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 16-33, and 36-49 are pending in the application. Claims 16-33 and

36-40 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, and 35 have

been canceled. New claims 41-49 have been added.

Substitute Specification

Minor changes have been made to the specification to place it in better form for U.S.

practice.

The above-noted specification changes are set forth in the attached Substitute

Specification. The Substitute Specification does not contain new matter.

A Comparison Specification showing the matter being added to and deleted from the

original specification is also submitted herewith.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the Substitute Specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, and 35 have been objected to because of some

informalities.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, and 35 have been canceled.

Other claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15, 34, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph,

because of some informalities.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, and 35 have been canceled.

Application No.: 10/671,447 Docket No.: 0425-1084P

Reply dated June 29, 2006

to Office Action of April 3, 2006

Page 19 of 21

Other rejected claims have been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

(a) Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Forbes et al. (USP 6,062,599). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 7, which includes

allowable subject matter, to place it in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 3, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on

claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Marchant (USP 5,564,743). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated in the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of

claim 7, which includes allowable subject matter, to place it in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency

on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Application No.: 10/671,447 Docket No.: 0425-1084P

Reply dated June 29, 2006

to Office Action of April 3, 2006

Page 20 of 21

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 4, 7-15, 34, and 35 would be

allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and

to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As stated in the foregoing with regard to the Section 102 rejection, claim 1 has been

amended to include all of the limitations of claim 7 to place claim 1 in condition for allowance.

Further, new claim 41, which includes all of the limitations of claims 1 and 8 (includes

allowable subject matter) has been added.

Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, and 35 have been canceled.

Claims 4, 9, 10, 13, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly

solicited.

New Claims

New claims 41-49 have been added.

As previously stated, independent claim 41, which includes all of the limitations of

claims 1 and 8 are allowable at least because it include allowable subject matter recited in claim

8.

Claims 42-49, variously dependent on claim 41, are allowable at least for their

dependency on claim 1.

Docket No.: 0425-1084P

Application No.: 10/671,447 Reply dated June 29, 2006

to Office Action of April 3, 2006

Page 21 of 21

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly

solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the

rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the

telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite

prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension

of time fees.

Dated: June 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Terrell C. Birch, Red. No. 19,382

BIRCH, STEWARY KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Substitute Specification - 46 pages

Comparison Specification - 46 pages